

REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 17-35. Claims 17 and 23-33 have been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

DRAWINGS

The drawings are objected to for informalities. Formal drawings have been attached to this response. Applicants respectfully request removal of the objection to the drawings.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 17-19, 23-24, 29, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Abler et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,504,851 B1 (hereinafter, Abler). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 17 recites, in part:

a plurality of detection devices for detecting ones of the types of connections, wherein said plurality of detection devices employ passive detection tests.

Abler does not teach or suggest, "a plurality of detection devices for detecting ones of the types of connections, wherein said plurality of detection devices employ passive detection tests," as claimed.

Abler teaches a technique in which one (or more) transceivers are programmed to perform different active tests to detect what type and speed of LAN may be present. Thus, Abler fails to teach or suggest the claimed plurality of detection devices that use a passive detection test, as claimed.

For the foregoing reasons, Claim 17 is neither taught nor suggested by Abler. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 17.

Claims 18-19 depend from Claim 17, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons. Therefore, Applicants earnestly request allowance of Claims 18-19.

Amended Claim 23 recites, in part:

a receptacle having a plurality of electrical connecting lines, wherein at least one of said plurality of electrical connecting lines is used to detect more than one type of communication protocol used in a connection to be made directly to said receptacle, such that said more than one type of communication protocol can be used in a connection made to said receptacle without requiring use of an intermediate connection device.

Abler does not teach or suggest, "wherein at least one of said plurality of electrical connecting lines is used to detect more than one type of communication protocol used in a connection to be made directly to said receptacle," as claimed.

In Figure 4, Abler depicts detecting a LAN protocol and its speed. For example, Abler may use RJ-45 contacts 7/8 to detect ATM-155 and ATM-25. However, Applicants note that this does not teach or suggest the claimed, "wherein at least one of said plurality of electrical connecting lines is used to detect *more than one type of communication protocol* used in a connection to be made directly to said receptacle." This is because both ATM-155 and ATM-25 are both the *same ATM protocol*.

For the foregoing reasons, Claim 23 is neither taught nor suggested by Abler. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 23.

Claims 24 and 29 depend from Claim 23, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons. Therefore, Applicants earnestly request allowance of Claims 24 and 29.

Claim 32 recites, in part:

wherein said detection devices in said b) and d) employ passive detection tests.

For at least the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 17, Claim 32 is respectfully believed to be allowable over Abler.

Claim 33 depends from Claim 32, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons. Therefore, Applicants earnestly request allowance of Claim 33.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 28, 30, and 31

Claims 28, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abler. Claims 28 and 31 recite that the protocol is an ISDN. Claim 30 recites that the protocol is a modem. For reasons discussed herein, Claim 23 is believed to be neither taught nor suggested by Abler. Claims 28, 30, and 31 depend from Claim 23. Therefore, Applicants earnestly request allowance of Claims 28, 30, and 31.

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 28, 30, and 31 are allowable for the following additional reasons. It would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Abler to arrive at the claimed limitations of detecting an ISDN or a modem. Abler teaches an ordered procedure for setting a transceiver (or transceivers) such that different types and speeds of LANS are detected. The rejection asserts that by merely replacing or adding detection devices to Abler one could realize embodiments of the present invention. Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection is incorrect. That is, modifying Abler by adjusting any of the transceivers or adding a new transceiver would not allow the detection of an ISDN or modem.

Further, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection's assertion is using the Applicants claims as a blueprint for modifying Abler and using only

what the Applicants have taught against the Applicants. For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Abler fails to teach or suggest Claims 28, 30 or 31.

Claims 20-22, 25-27, and 34-35

Claims 20-22, 25-27, and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abler in view of Blackwell et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,671,251 (hereinafter, Blackwell).

Applicants traverse the rejection to Claims 20-22, 25-27, and 34-35 on the grounds that combining Blackwell with Abler would render Abler inoperative. As Applicants have previously discussed, Abler teaches altering the settings on a transceiver to force the transceiver to perform a different logical test. Applicants respectfully assert that adding a detection device to Abler the detects for voltage or current would render Abler inoperative. For example, referring to Figure 6 of Abler, Applicants respectfully assert that such a detection device could not be simply added along with the Ethernet transceiver 248, the token ring transceiver 258, and the ATM transceiver 268. Referring to Figure 7 of Abler, Applicants respectfully assert that the common physical transceiver 288 could not simply be modified into a device that performs a test for current or voltage in the claimed manner.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 20-22, 25-27, and 34-35 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Abler and Blackwell. Consequently, Applicants earnestly request allowance of these claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 17-35 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 17-35 is solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 5/3, 2004

Ronald M. Pomerenke  
Ronald M. Pomerenke  
Registration No. 43,009

Address: WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113

Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile